

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of June 23, 2006.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1- 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Pine Harbor in the article "How to Build a Shed," Copyright 2000 (hereinafter Harbor).

Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harbor and U.S. Patent No. 6,321,243 issued to Ballard.

The Non-Art and Art Rejections

Although Applicants respectfully traverse the arguments in the Office Action of June 23, 2006, Applicants have canceled claims 1-9 and take this opportunity to add new claims 10-24 in order to move prosecution of this application forward and in order to address issues stated in the Examiner's Response to Arguments. Each of the claims is directed toward statutory subject matter and to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. More specifically, system claim 16 includes the necessary hardware for the recited functionality to be realized, and none of the claims make use of the terms "understood" or "understandable" which the Examiner argues cannot be given reasonable meaning.

New independent claim 10 is directed to a method for reducing language-related misunderstanding of instructions. The claim is more specifically directed to a method suitable for implementation either manually or on a system which translates a user input written instruction and creates ordered glyphs which represent glyph instructions based on the written instruction. More specifically, the claim recites limitations for identifying inputted

words and phrases, matching the words and phrases to previously stored words and phrases, and syntactically ordering glyph images based on a type designation and an ordering designation associated with the stored words and phrases. Applicants submit that these, and other, recited features of the claim are not taught in the cited references. In particular, limitations have been recited such that each of the generated glyphs can be interpreted to be of only one specific type (action, material or instrumentation), and cannot be interpreted as one of the remaining types. Support for these particular limitations can be found in paragraphs 44 and 55 of the present application.

New independent claim 16 is directed to a method for creating glyph instructions by a glyph generating system. Claim 16, however, is directed to a method particularly suitable for implementation on a computer system which displays pluralities of glyphs for selection by a user. Both of the subject method claims are directed toward generating glyph instructions for a person to follow in performing a process but which are independent of any particular written language. Claim 16 also recites a limitation wherein each of the outputted selected glyphs includes a visibly discernable design feature identifying the corresponding type designation of the selected glyph. This limitation facilitates interpreting a particular outputted glyph as being of only one type (action, material or instrumentation), and not being any of the remaining types. Applicants submit that the recited features of claims 10 and 16 are not taught in the cited references.

New independent claim 20 is directed to a pictographic system which implements the methods set forth in claims 10 and 16. Claim 20 recites the essential components of a system which can incorporate embodiments of an automated glyph creation process or a manually directed glyph creation process. In particular, the system includes a computing unit, an input device, an electronic storage device and an output device. Support for each of these devices can be found in paragraph 50 of the present application.

Applicants submit that all claims remaining in the present application are in condition for allowance. It is further submitted by Applicants that the aforementioned new claims do not introduce any new matter beyond that included in the application as originally filed. The amendments have been made only to more clearly recite the claimed features.

Claims 10-24 remain in this application.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 10-20) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark S. Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

11/26/01
Date


Mark S. Svat, Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582